

Remarks

This Amendment has revised the application such that it is believed to distinguish over the prior art so as to be in allowable condition.

At the outset, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of the interview conducted on December 21, 2004. As agreed to during that interview, claim 1 and hence its remaining dependent claims 3-17 have been amended to distinguish over the PCT publication WO 96/02456 of Flux on which claim 1 and its dependent claims were previously rejected. This Flux reference has pivotal attachment members 121, 122 that pivot with respect to each other about unnumbered stub axles that are spaced from each other along the axis of pivoting and the axis of rotation of rotary members 101, 102.

In the present invention as now claimed by claim 1 and its dependent claims 3-17, an axle extends continuously between the rotary members along a common axis of rotation to provide support thereof about the common axis of rotation. Furthermore, each rotary member has a hub with a recess and a notch that receives the elongate member to permit the slipper member to cover or expose the space for attachment or release of the elongate member. More specifically, the attachment includes a movable link assembly that is moved between a blocking position to prevent access of the elongated support member to the notches and a release position that allows such access for the attachment or release.

The prior art does not teach or in any way suggest a load transfer device whose rotary members are supported by an axle extending continuously therebetween as claimed together with an attachment with a movable link assembly that moves between blocking and release positions with respect to notches of the rotary members so that the slipper member will only permit detachment when the device is not being utilized to provide attachment. For example, in the United States Patent 5,245,931 Cuny a shoe 9 is movable over a cable 22 which is received between branches 5 and 6 of wheels 2 and 3; however, there is no provision to permit or prevent attachment of the cable 22 by blocking and release positions of the

attachment so as to insure that there is no unintended release of the cable. Likewise, the other references of record including the '456 Flux patent discussed above do not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable, it is respectfully submitted that all of claims 3-17 should be considered and that all of these claims are allowable for the reasons set forth above.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in an allowable condition such that it is appropriate to hereby solicit its allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

PETER ROBERT FLUX

By James A. Kushman
James A. Kushman
Reg. No. 25,634
Attorney for Applicant

Date: January 4, 2005

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351